

Exhibit C

11th Circuit Court of Appeals May 7, 2020 Order

In re: Equifax Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation,
No. 17-md-2800-TWT (N.D. Ga.)

Plaintiffs' Opposition to Frank and Watkins' Motion to Clarify
or, Alternatively, to Supplement the Record

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-10249-RR

In Re: Equifax, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation

SHIYANG HUANG,
THEODORE H. FRANK,
DAVID R. WATKINS,
MIKELL WEST,
CHRISTOPHER ANDREWS,
GEORGE W. COCHRAN,
ALICE-MARIE FLOWERS,

Movants - Appellants,

BRIAN F. SPECTOR,
JAMES MCGONNIGAL,
RANDOLPH JEFFERSON CARY, III,
ROBIN D. PORTER,
WILLIAM R. PORTER, et al.,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

versus

EQUIFAX INC.,
DOES 1 THROUGH 50, INCLUSIVE,
EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES LLC,
a foreign limited liability company,
EQUIFAX INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, LLC,
DOES 1 THROUGH 10, et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States
District Court for the Northern District of Georgia

BEFORE: WILLIAM PRYOR, ROSENBAUM, and LAGOA, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Before the Court is the “Motion of Plaintiffs-Appellees for Consolidation and to Expedite Appeals.”

To the extent that the motion seeks to consolidate the appeals, the motion is DENIED AS MOOT. The relevant notices of appeal already are proceeding under appeal no. 20-10249-RR and will proceed on the same schedule.

To the extent the motion seeks to expedite the briefing in this appeal, this appeal is not yet ready for briefing because Appellant Christopher Andrews’ motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal is still pending in the district court. *See* 11th Cir. R. 31-1(b). The motion to expedite briefing is therefore DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to refiling such a motion after Appellant Christopher Andrews’ motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal is resolved. The district court is requested to expedite consideration of this motion.

Appellants Theodore H. Frank and David R. Watkins’ “Cross-Motion for Sanctions” is DENIED.

Appellants Theodore H. Frank and David R. Watkins’ “Motion for Relief under Fed. R. App. Proc. 10(e)(2)(C)” is DENIED.